

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of September 13, 2007 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 9, 11 - 13 and 15 -17 have been examined.

There are a number of issues raised by the examiner in the Office Action. We will deal with the issues in the order presented in the Office Action. The enumeration will coincide with that used by the examiner.

5. The identifier for claim 16 has been corrected.

7. The objection to the drawings because the "GPS module" "must be shown." In fact the GPS module is shown in Fig. 2.

8. The expression "I Claim" has been added to the specification before claim 9.

9.1.1 The rejection of claims 9 and 17 as indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is noted. In reply, both claims 9 and 17 have been amended to delete the reference to "of process automation technology." This recitation should not be confusion. All it means is that th field bus is used in the field of automation technology. Still, if the examiner believes that it creates confusion, then its deletion should overcome this problem.

In addition, the recitation of a "field bus" as a positive recitation has been deleted as it is not a part of the field bus distribution unit but is only connected to it.

The above represents the extent of applicant's understanding of what the examiner is saying under 9.1.1.

9.1.1.1 is not understood. The examiner first states "...that one of ordinary skill would not be able to ascertain either: (1) what applicant intends as being included as

part of the claimed invention; or (2) what the inventor's contribution to the prior art is..." The examiner then cites *In re Larsen* and notes that it instructs us to look to "...the totality of all the limitations of the claim.....to ascertain the inventor's contribution to the art." It is respectfully submitted, that if the examiner follows the instruction of *In re Larsen* he would know what the inventor's contribution is. What exactly is the examiner asking for in 9.1.1.1? It is not clear.

9.1.1.2 is not understood.

9.1.2 Claim 12 now ends with a period.

9.1.3 and 9.1.4 is not understood.

10.1 The examiner rejects claims 9, 11 - 13, 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) over Pickett or Beaverstock et al or Warrior et al or Sugihara et al "as applied to claims 9 & 15" and further in view of either palmer et al or Oba et al.

There is no application of Pickett or beaverstock et al or warrior et al or Sugihara et al against claims 9 & 15. Clarification is requested.

10.1.1 what does the passage spanning lines 8 - 23 on page 9 of the Office Action have to do with claim 9, for example. A general discourse on a control system does very little to notify applicant what the basis of the rejection is. Clarification is requested.

10.1.2 This passage presents nothing but speculation not examination. What is the rejection? Clarification is requested.


The remainder of the Office Action does not appear to require any comment.

The examiner is urged to reconsider and re-examine this application, to consider the claims as amended and to allow claims 9, 11 - 13 and 15 - 17 over the art of record, or in the alternative specify why the amended claims are not patentable and specifically

over what art and for what reasons that can be supported by the reference(s).

Date: March 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Felix J. D'Ambrosio', written over the printed name.

Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 25,721

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\DAI3005-PS0020\March 13 2008 Response.wpd